```
Daniel Feinberg – CA State Bar No. 135983
    Todd F. Jackson - CA State Bar No. 202598
    Margaret E. Hasselman - CA State Bar No. 228529
    Nina Wasow - CA State Bar No. 202047
   LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE, RENAKER & JACKSON, P.C.
    1330 Broadway, Suite 1800
    Oakland, CA 94612
    Telephone: (510) 839-6824
    Facsimile: (510) 839-7839
    Email: dfeinberg@lewisfeinberg.com
    Email: tiackson@lewisfeinberg.com
 6
    Email: mhasselman@lewisfeinberg.com
    Email: nwasow@lewisfeinberg.com
 7
 8
    Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class
    (Counsel continued on next page)
 9
                       IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
                    FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11
                       SAN FRANCISCO AND OAKLAND DIVISION
12
13
    THOMAS FERNANDEZ and LORA SMITH,
                                              Case No. C-06-07339 MJJ
    individually and on behalf of a class of all other
14
    persons similarly situated,
15
                      Plaintiffs.
                                              STIPULATION AND PROPOSED
                                              ORDER TO AMEND COMPLAINT
16
          VS.
17
   K-M INDUSTRIES HOLDING CO., INC.;
    K-M INDUSTRIES HOLDING CO., INC.
   ESOP PLAN COMMITTEE; WILLÍAM E.
18
   AND DESIREE B. MOORE REVOCABLE
   TRUST: TRUSTEES OF THE WILLIAM E.
19
    AND DESIREE B. MOORE REVOCABLE
20
   TRUST; CIG ESOP PLAN COMMITTEE:
   NORTH STAR TRUST COMPANY;
   DESIREE B. MOORE REVOCABLE TRUST;
21
    WILLIAM E. MOORE MARITAL TRUST;
    WILLIAM E. MOORE GENERATION-
22
    SKIPPING TRUST; and DESIREE MOORE,
   BOTH IN HER INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY
23
    AND AS TRUSTEE OF THE WILLIAM E.
   AND DESIREE B. MOORE REVOCABLE
    TRUST'S SUCCESSOR TRUSTS NAMED
25
    ABOVE,
26
                     Defendants
27
28
```

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO AMEND COMPLAINT [CASE NO. C-06-07339 MJJ]

4

9

7

WHEREAS, the Court's Pretrial Order states that parties may be added until May 25, 2007;

WHEREAS, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a), a party may amend a pleading by leave of court or by written consent of the adverse party;

WHEREAS Plaintiffs wish to amend their complaint by adding parties and making certain other changes to the allegations of the complaint;

WHEREAS Defendants are willing to consent to the filing of the proposed first amended complaint ("FAC") only if conditioned on Plaintiffs' express agreement as follows:

- Defendants' consent is solely a procedural accommodation;
- Defendants' consent does not represent and will not be urged by Plaintiffs to represent any acknowledgment of the propriety of any or all of Plaintiffs' existing or proposed claims and/or amendments; and
- By entering into this Stipulation, no party waives any substantive rights.

 Defendants have not waived but instead have preserved in full all their substantive rights and defenses, including but not limited to: all substantive arguments that could have been interposed in or as part of an opposition to a motion for leave to amend the complaint; and defenses arising out of applicable statutes of limitation, and the doctrines of laches and estoppel.

Accordingly IT IS HEREBY AGREED AND STIPULATED by the parties through their counsel of record, as follows:

- 1. Plaintiffs may file a FAC in the form attached hereto as Exhibit 1;
- 2. Defendants' consent to the filing of the FAC is solely a procedural accommodation;
- Defendants' consent does not represent and will not be urged by Plaintiffs to represent any acknowledgment of the propriety of any or all of Plaintiffs' existing or proposed claims and/or amendments; and
- 4. By entering into this Stipulation, no party waives any substantive rights.

1	Defendants have not waived but instead have preserved in full all their substantive		
2	rights and defenses, including but not limited to: all substantive arguments that		
3	could have been interposed in or as part of an opposition to a motion for leave to		
4	amend the complaint; and defenses arising out of applicable statutes of limitation,		
5	and the doctrines of laches and esto	oppel.	
6			
7	Dated: May 25, 2007	LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE, RENAKER & JACKSON, P.C.	
8		RENARER & JACKSON, F.C.	
9	Ву:	/s/ Todd Jackson	
10		Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class	
11		una me i roposca Ciass	
12	Dated:	LOVITT & HANNAN, INC.	
13	By:		
14	_ , .	Henry Bornstein Attorneys for Defendant K-M Industries	
15 16		Holding Čo., Inc.; K-M Industries Holding Co., Inc. ESOP Plan Committee; and CIG ESOP Plan Committee	
17			
18	Dated:	HENNIGAN, BENNETT & DORMAN LLF	
19	D.		
20	By:	Robert L. Palmer	
21		Attorneys for Defendant William E. and Desiree B. Moore Revocable Trust; Desiree	
22		B. Moore Revocable Trust; William E. Moore Marital Trust; William E. and	
23		Desiree B. Moore Revocable Trust Generation-Skipping Trust; and Desiree	
24		Moore	
25			
26	/// ///		
27			
28			
	STIPLII ATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO AMEND COMPLAINT [CASE NO. C_06_07330 M.H.]		

Defendants have not waived but instead have preserved in full all their substantive 1 2 rights and defenses, including but not limited to: all substantive arguments that 3 could have been interposed in or as part of an opposition to a motion for leave to 4 amend the complaint; and defenses arising out of applicable statutes of limitation, 5 and the doctrines of laches and estoppel. 6 7 Dated: LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE, 8 RENAKER & JACKSON, P.C. 9 By: Todd Jackson 10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class 11 12 Dated: May 25, 2007 LOVITT & HANNAN, INC. 13 By: 14 Henry Bornstein Attorneys for Defendant K-M Industries 15 Holding Co., Inc.; K-M Industries Holding Co., Inc. ESOP Plan Committee; and CIG 16 ESOP Plan Committee 17 18 Dated: MAY 25, 250 7 HENNIGAN, BENNETT & DORMAN LLP 19 By: 20 21 Attorneys for Defendant William E. and Desiree B. Moore Revocable Trust; Desiree B. Moore Revocable Trust; William E. 22 Moore Marital Trust; William E. and Desiree B. Moore Revocable Trust 23 Generation-Skipping Trust; and Desiree 24 Moore 25 26 27 28 STIPULATION TO AMEND COMPLAINT [CASE No. C-06-07339 MJJ] Page 2

1	Dated: May 25, 2007	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
2	D	lal
3	By:	/s/ Vicole Diller
4	A C	ttorneys for Defendant North Star Trust Company
5		
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
7	Dated: May 29, 2007	of Jarine
8	H.	Ion. Martin J. Jenkins Inited States District Judge
9		finited States District Judge
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO AMEND CO	MPLAINT [CASE No. C-06-07339 MJJ] Page 3